

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

JOHN WINGO, Plaintiff, v. 3M COMPANY, Defendant.	No. 22-CV-993 (WMW/JFD) SECOND ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER
TITUS KARGBO, Plaintiffs, v. 3M COMPANY, Defendant.	No. 22-CV-996 (WMW/JFD)
DESIREE HOLLER, Plaintiff, v. 3M COMPANY, Defendant.	No. 22-CV-998 (WMW/JFD)

VAUGHN WINGO,

Plaintiff,

v.

3M COMPANY,

Defendant.

No. 22-CV-1890 (WMW/JFD)

This matter is before the Court on Moving Plaintiffs’ Motions for Reconsideration of the Court’s bench ruling in four of the six related cases against Defendant 3M.¹ The Court already denied Moving Plaintiffs’ requests² for reconsideration. (Dkt. No. 117.) The instant motions are earlier drafts of the requests that the Court just denied. Moving Plaintiffs asked that the Court base its decision on the later executed (but earlier received) requests. (Letter to Magistrate Judge 2, Dkt. No. 116 in 22-CV-993 (WMW/JFD) (“We kindly request that the court accept this amended motion and consider it in lieu of the previously filed document.”).) The Court did so, and now finds these earlier requests to be moot.

¹ (Dkt. No. 118 in 22-CV-993 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 99 in 22-CV-996 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 114 in 22-CV-998 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 88 in 22-CV-1890 (WMW/JFD).) These requests were dated November 14 (except Mr. Kargbo’s, whose request was dated Nov. 11) and received on November 20.

² (Dkt. No. 114 in 22-CV-993 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 95 in 22-CV-996 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 110 in 22-CV-998 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 84 in 22-CV-1890 (WMW/JFD).) These requests were dated November 15 and received on November 16.

Therefore, based on the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Moving Plaintiffs' Motions to Reconsider are **DENIED**.³

Date: November 22, 2023

s/ John F. Docherty
JOHN F. DOCHERTY
United States Magistrate Judge

³ (Dkt. No. 118 in 22-CV-993 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 99 in 22-CV-996 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 114 in 22-CV-998 (WMW/JFD); Dkt. No. 88 in 22-CV-1890 (WMW/JFD).)